UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,112	11/30/2001	Sadao Ohsawa	Q67511	8145

7590 09/08/2003

Sughrue Mion Zinn
Macpeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER
FUNK, STEPHEN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2854	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/980,112	Applicant(s) OHSAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Stephen R Funk	Art Unit 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification does not provide support for the recitation in claims 2, 4, 12, 18, 20, 34, 36, 55, 58, 61, 64, 67, and 70 of the oil based ink being solid and hydrophobic at least at "one" temperature.

Claims 7, 8, 23, 24, 35 - 48, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, and 72 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claims 7, 56, 59, 62, 65, 68, and 71 the recitation of the "plate cylinder mounted on the plate material" has no clear meaning as the plate material is mounted on the plate cylinder.

In claims 8, 57, 60, 63, 66, 69, and 72 it is not clear how the subscanning is carried out by the head "approaching and separating" from the plate cylinder in an axial direction. The recording head would appear to maintain the same distance from the plate cylinder as it scans along the axial direction of the plate cylinder.

In claim 23 line 2 "a printing medium" would appear to be a double recitation of "a plate material" in claim 19 line 2.

In claim 35 line 6 "an image forming means" is a double recitation of the same in line 1.

In claims 59 and 68 line 2 "the plate cylinder" lacks proper antecedent basis.

In claims 62 and 71 "the plate material" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 49 - 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of claims 49 - 51 the recitations in the second and last paragraphs appear to be method steps of using the apparatus and therefore render the scope of the claims indefinite. An apparatus claim cannot be limited by method steps of using the apparatus in a particular manner.

In each of claims 52 - 54 the recitations in the last paragraph do not clearly recite individual method steps of "stepping" the recording head. Furthermore, the language is confusing and unclear. It is presumed that the recitation "repeatedly performing a step of roughly all channel widths so that no gap is produced" refers to the step B shown in Figure 11C. However, it is not clear how the term "roughly" modifies the scope of the claims. Secondly, it is presumed that the recitation "a step of the distance of adjacent dots which is determined by the resolution of recorded images being repeated a predetermined number of times" refers to the steps A in Figure 11C. However, it is not clear which step is being referred to in the recitation "so as not to lap the dots over the dots of the adjacent channels". See the paragraph bridging pages 20 and 21 in the specification.

Applicant is advised that should claim 19 be found allowable, claim 35 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). In this instance, the apparent inferential recitations of the "plate material" and "printing medium" do not distinguish the structure of one claim from the other.

Applicant is advised that should claim 50 be found allowable, claim 51 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing,

despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). In this instance, the apparent inferential recitations of the "plate material" and "printing medium" do not distinguish the structure of one claim from the other.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 33, 35, 37, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Okano et al. (WO 99/34982). Okano et al. teach directly forming an image onto a printing medium (7) produced by an ink jet (2) having a plurality of ejection channels (5) which ejects an oil based ink (sentence bridging pages 6 and 7) utilizing an electrostatic field wherein the distance between the ejection channels is from 200 to 600 μm (page 8). The recitation of the ejection channels having 150 dpi or less is inherent in the channels being spaced 200 to 600 μm. See also column 2 line 35 - column 3 line 15, column 4 line 16 - column 5 line 65 of the English equivalent (US 6,412,916).

With respect to claim 37 note the fixing device (10).

With respect to claim 43 note the ink supplying means (3).

With respect to claim 44 note the ink recovering means (4).

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 17 - 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 33 - 37, 39, 40, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (JP 10-202,822) in view of Okano et al.

Kato et al. teach the method and apparatus as recited with exception of the distance between the electrodes being 170 μm or more. See the entire document of Kato. Okano et al. teach the desirability of spacing the channels by a distance from 200 to 600 μm. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the method and apparatus of Kato with ejection channels spaced a distance greater than 170 μm in view of Okano et al. so as to prevent crosstalk between neighboring channels.

With respect to claims 2, 4, 12, 18, 20, 34, and 36 note claim 2 of Kato.

With respect to claims 5, 21, and 37 note the fixing device (10) of Okano et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus and method of Kato with the capability of fixing the ink in view of Okano et al. so as to provide a more durable image on the plate material.

With respect to claims 7, 8, 23, 24, 39, and 40 imaging by rotating the drum and axially moving the ink jet are both widely conventional in the art. Note Figures 1 and 2 of Kato, for example.

With respect to claims 9, 27, and 43 note the ink supplying means (3) of Okano et al. However, it is noted that ink supplying means are inherent in any ink jet head.

With respect to claims 10, 28, and 44 note the ink recovering means (4) of Okano et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the ink jet head of Kato with ink recovering means in view of Okano et al. so as to recycle unused ink.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claims 6, 22, 25, 26, 38, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Okano et al. as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Masaaki et al. (JP 58-147,373). Kato does not teach dust removing means or pinching capstan rollers. Masaaki et al. teach the conventionality of a dust removing means (11) and capstan rollers. See Figures 3 - 5 of Masaaki et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus and method of Kato, as modified by Okano et al., with dust removing means and capstan rollers in view of Masaaki et al. to provide a clear image on the plate material and keep the plate material flat when imaging.

Claims 11 - 13, 29 - 31, and 45 - 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Okano et al. as applied to claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 17 - 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 33 - 37, 39, 40, 43, and 44 above, and further in view of Arway et al. (US 4,555,712). Kato does not teach an ink temperature control, ink concentration control, or stirring means. Arway et al. teach the conventionality of an ink temperature control (40) and ink concentration control (44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus and method of Kato, as modified by Okano et al., with the ink control means of Arway et al. so as to provide a consistent quality ink to the plate material. It is noted that

stirring means are widely conventional in the art to provide a homogenous ink to the recording head.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Okano et al. as applied to claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 17 - 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 33 - 37, 39, 40, 43, and 44 above, and further in view of Ikkatai (US 5,363,132). Kato does not teach head separating means. Ikkatai teaches the conventionality of separating an ink jet head when not imaging. See column 2 line 45 - 52 of Ikkatai. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus of Kato, as modified by Okano et al., with a head separating means in view of Ikkatai so as to protect the head when not imaging.

Claims 15, 32, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view Okano et al. as applied to claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 17 - 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 33 - 37, 39, 40, 43, and 44 above, and further in view of Totsugi (JP 02-95,862). Kato does not teach head cleaning means. Totsugi teaches the conventionality of cleaning an ink jet head. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus of Kato, as modified by Okano et al., with a head cleaner in view of Totsugi so as to prevent the head from clogging.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Okano et al. as applied to claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 17 - 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 33 - 37, 39, 40, 43, and 44 above, and further in view of Gasparrini (US 5,322,015). Kato does not teach paper dust removing means. Gasparrini teaches the conventionality of a dust removing means. See the paragraph bridging columns 5 and 6 of Gasparrini. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus of Kato, as modified by Okano et al., with a

dust removing means in view of Gasparrini so as to prevent dust from interfering with the printed image.

Claims 49 - 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (JP 10-202,822) in view of Okano et al. and Kikuchi et al. (US 6,213,585).

Kato et al. teach the method and apparatus as recited with exception of the distance between the ejection channels being 170 μm or more and the distance between adjacent ejection channels being greater than the distance between adjacent dots. See the entire document of Kato. Okano et al. teach the desirability of spacing the channels by a distance from 200 to 600 μm. Kikuchi et al. disclose the conventionality of an ink jet recording device wherein the distance (L) between adjacent ejection channels being greater than the distance (L/2) between adjacent dots (15, 16). See Figure 12, column 2 lines 15 - 31, column 3 lines 18 - 23, column 4 line 64 - column 5 line 12, and column 9 lines 26 - 37 of Kikuchi et al., for example. Accordingly, Kikuchi et al. teach a step of the distance of adjacent dots determined by the resolution of the image. Note that Kato shows in Figure 1 an ink jet recording device (10) having a small number of adjacent ejection channels wherein a step of roughly all channel widths would be necessary after the step of adjacent dots. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the method and apparatus of Kato with ejection channels spaced a distance 170 μm or more in view of Okano et al. so as to prevent crosstalk between neighboring channels and provide the distance between adjacent ejection channels greater than the distance between adjacent dots in view of Kikuchi et al. so as to increase the resolution of the image beyond the fixed resolution of the ink jet recording device.

With respect to claims 55, 58, 61, 64, 67, and 70 note claim 2 of Kato.

With respect to claims 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, and 72 imaging by rotating the drum and axially moving the ink jet are both widely conventional in the art. Note Figures 1 and 2 of Kato, for example.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claims 1 - 4, 7 - 9, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 27, 33 - 36, 39, 40, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (JP 10-202,822) in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. (US 5,001,496 and Cielo et al. (US 4,166,277).

Kato et al. teach the method and apparatus as recited with exception of the distance between the ejection channels being 170 μm or more. See the entire document of Kato. Vermot-Gaud et al. teach the desirability of spacing the channels by a distance of 250 μm. See the sentence bridging columns 6 and 7 of Vermot-Gaud et al., for example. Cielo et al. also teach the desirability of spacing the channels by a distance of 250 μm. See column 3 lines 11 - 12 of Cielo et al., for example. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the method and apparatus of Kato with ejection channels spaced a distance 170 μm or more in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. so as to prevent crosstalk between neighboring channels.

With respect to claims 2, 4, 12, 18, 20, 34, and 36 note claim 2 of Kato.

With respect to claims 7, 8, 23, 24, 39, and 40 imaging by rotating the drum and axially moving the ink jet are both widely conventional in the art. Note Figures 1 and 2 of Kato, for example.

With respect to claims 9, 27, and 43 ink supplying means are inherent in any ink jet head.

Claims 5, 21, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Kojima et al. Kato does not teach fixing the ink image. Kojima et al. teach the conventionality of fixing the ink image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus and method of Kato, as modified by Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al., with the capability of fixing the ink in view of Kojima et al. so as to provide a more durable image on the plate material.

Claims 6, 22, 25, 26, 38, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. as applied to claims 1 - 4, 7 - 9, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 27, 33 - 36, 39, 40, and 43 above, and further in view of Masaaki et al. (JP 58-147,373). Kato does not teach dust removing means or pinching capstan rollers. Masaaki et al. teach the conventionality of a dust removing means (11) and capstan rollers. See Figures 3 - 5 of Masaaki et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus and method of Kato, as modified by Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al., with dust removing means and capstan rollers in view of Masaaki et al. to provide a clear image on the plate material and keep the plate material flat when imaging.

Claims 10 - 13, 28 - 31, and 44 - 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. as applied to claims 1 - 4, 7 - 9, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 27, 33 - 36, 39, 40, and 43 above, and further in view of Arway et al. (US 4,555,712). Kato does not teach an ink recovery means, ink temperature control, ink

concentration control, or stirring means. Arway et al. teach the conventionality of ink recovery means (26), an ink temperature control (40) and ink concentration control (44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus and method of Kato, as modified by Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al., with the ink control means of Arway et al. so as to provide a consistent quality ink to the plate material. It is noted that stirring means are widely conventional in the art to provide a homogenous ink to the recording head.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. as applied to claims 1 - 4, 7 - 9, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 27, 33 - 36, 39, 40, and 43 above, and further in view of Ikkatai (US 5,363,132). Kato does not teach head separating means. Ikkatai teaches the conventionality of separating an ink jet head when not imaging. See column 2 line 45 - 52 of Ikkatai. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus of Kato, as modified by Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al., with a head separating means in view of Ikkatai so as to protect the head when not imaging.

Claims 15, 32, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. as applied to claims 1 - 4, 7 - 9, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 27, 33 - 36, 39, 40, and 43 above, and further in view of Totsugi (JP 02-95,862). Kato does not teach head cleaning means. Totsugi teaches the conventionality of cleaning an ink jet head. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus of Kato, as modified by Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al., with a head cleaner in view of Totsugi so as to prevent the head from clogging.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. as applied to claims 1 - 4, 7 - 9, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 27, 33 - 36, 39, 40, and 43 above, and further in view of Gasparrini (US 5,322,015). Kato does not teach paper dust removing means. Gasparrini teaches the conventionality of a dust removing means. See the paragraph bridging columns 5 and 6 of Gasparrini. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the apparatus of Kato, as modified by Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al., with a dust removing means in view of Gasparrini so as to prevent dust from interfering with the printed image.

Claims 49 - 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (JP 10-202,822) in view of Vermot-Gaud et al., Cielo et al., and Kikuchi et al.

Kato et al. teach the method and apparatus as recited with exception of the distance between the ejection channels being 170 μm or more and the distance between adjacent ejection channels being greater than the distance between adjacent dots. See the entire document of Kato. Vermot-Gaud et al. teach the desirability of spacing the channels by a distance of 250 μm. See the sentence bridging columns 6 and 7 of Vermot-Gaud et al., for example. Cielo et al. also teach the desirability of spacing the channels by a distance of 250 μm. See column 3 lines 11 - 12 of Cielo et al., for example. Kikuchi et al. disclose the conventionality of an ink jet recording device wherein the distance (L) between adjacent ejection channels being greater than the distance (L/2) between adjacent dots (15, 16). See Figure 12, column 2 lines 15 - 31, column 3 lines 18 - 23, column 4 line 64 - column 5 line 12, and column 9 lines 26 - 37 of Kikuchi et al., for example. Accordingly, Kikuchi et al. teach a step of the distance of adjacent dots determined by the resolution of the image. Note that Kato shows in Figure 1 an

ink jet recording device (10) having a small number of adjacent ejection channels wherein a step of roughly all channel widths would be necessary after the step of adjacent dots. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the method and apparatus of Kato with ejection channels spaced a distance 170 μm or more in view of Vermot-Gaud et al. and Cielo et al. so as to prevent crosstalk between neighboring electrodes and provide the distance between adjacent ejection channels greater than the distance between adjacent dots in view of Kikuchi et al. so as to increase the resolution of the image while beyond the fixed resolution of the ink jet recording device.

With respect to claims 55, 58, 61, 64, 67, and 70 note claim 2 of Kato.

With respect to claims 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, and 72 imaging by rotating the drum and axially moving the ink jet are both widely conventional in the art. Note Figures 1 and 2 of Kato, for example.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See column 4 lines 33 - 53 of Abe et al. ('149), column 5 lines 50 - 54 and the sentence bridging columns 7 and 8 of Dagna ('296), column 5 lines 4 - 62 of Fox ('486), column 1 lines 49 - 55 and column 2 lines 47 - 58 of Kishimoto et al. ('912), and column 1 line 66 - column 2 line 54 of Mills et al. ('346).

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument that the references do not specifically address the dpi of the ejection channels is not persuasive since the disclosed distances between the ejection channels of Okano

et al., Vermot-Gaud et al., and Cielo et al. being 170 μm or more inherently possess a dpi of 150 or less.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen R. Funk whose telephone number is (703) 308-0982. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (703) 305-6619.

The fax phone number for *official* papers is (703) 308-7722, 7724. The fax number for those wishing an auto-reply verifying receipt of *official* papers is (703) 872-9318 or for After Final actions is (703) 872-9319. Upon consulting with the examiner *unofficial* papers only may be faxed directly to the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

SRF
August 25, 2003

STEPHEN R. FUNK
PRIMARY EXAMINER